

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested. Claims 1-6 and 8-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Matsuura et al. (US 20010030773 A1). Claims 7 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuura et al. (US 20010030773 A1) in view of Culp et al. (US 6973453 B2). Claims 15-16, 19-20, 23, and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuura et al. (US 20010030773 A1) in view of Meitav et al. (US 20040252201 A1). Claims 17 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuura et al. (US 20010030773 A1) in view of Meitav et al. (US 20040252201 A1) as applied to claims 15-16, 19-20, 23, and 25 above, and further in view of Haas et al. (US 20040012810 A1). Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuura et al. (US 20010030773 A1) in view of Meitav et al. (US 20040252201 A1) as applied to claims 15-16, 19-20, 23, and 25 above, and further in view of Tanaka et al. (US 20030001959 A1). Claims 22 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuura et al. (US 20010030773 A1) in view of Meitav et al. (US 20040252201 A1) as applied to claims 15-16, 19-20, 23, and 25 above, and further in view of Culp et al. (US 6973453 B2).

Claims 1, 6, 7, 11, 13, 15, 18, 20, 21, 22, 24, and 25 have been amended. No claims have been canceled. No claims were amended because of the content disclosed in the cited art.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-6 and 8-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by

Matsuura. Applicants respectfully disagree.

The Office Action states “Matsuura discloses a method, comprising: limiting a one-time-use digital video camera having a digital storage medium for a single use cycle (Matsuura: Fig. 8; paragraph [0044]); and refurbishing the one-time-use digital video recorder for another use cycle of the one-time-use digital video recorder (Matsuura: Fig. 2).” However Matsuura discloses a digital camera for taking still digital photographs. Applicants claim 1 recites a different device. Independent claim 1 recites a digital video camera for taking digital video footage. For example, MPEG and WMV files verses JPEG and Bitmap files.

The office action continues this confusion for the remainder of the rejections. For example, the office action states “Culp discloses an image collection enhancement method, in which a user's image collection may be augmented by professional pictures (Culp: column 1 J lines 54-67; column 2, lines 13-22). Culp further discloses the possibility of utilizing software applications for enhancing the quality of the image collection (Culp: column 1, lines 27-35; column 2, lines 3-12). Since both Matsuura and Culp relate to processing collections of user images, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found it obvious to combine the organizational method of Culp with the digital photograph system of Matsuura in order to enhance the user's picture collection by supplementing it with additional photos (Culp: column 1, lines 41-44) when the customer brings the camera to the photo kiosk (Culp: column 4, lines 49-51 and Matsuura: Fig. 2, open terminal).” Therefore, Matsuura does not disclose each and every limitation of claim 1. As such, claim 1, as amended, is not anticipated by Matsuura under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). applicants reserve the right to swear behind any

102 (e) reference at a later date.

Given that claims 2-10 depend from and include the limitations of claim 1, applicants submit that claims 2-10 are not anticipated by Matsuura under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Independent claims 11 and 15 also recite limitations directed at digital video cameras. The additional references cited by the Office Action do not make up for the deficiencies in Matsuura discussed above. Thus, independent claims 11 and 15 and their respective dependent claims are patentably distinct from Matsuura and the various combined references under 35 USC 103 for their own reasons but similar to the above arguments.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that in view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the rejections and objections have been overcome. A petition for an extension of time is submitted with this amendment. Applicants reserve all rights with respect to the application of the doctrine equivalents. If there are any additional charges, please charge them to our Deposit Account No. 50-2191. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,
RUTAN & TUCKER, LLP

Dated: 12-21-07
611 Anton Blvd, Suite 1400
Costa Mesa, CA 92626
(650) 320-1500

/Thomas Ferrill/
Thomas S. Ferrill
Reg. No. 42,532